O PE COO DE LA TRANSPER P

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

PLICANT:

Ulrich Schiestl et al.

SERIAL NO.:

10/828,763

FILED:

April 20, 2004

FOR:

Combustion-Engined Setting Tool

EXAMINER:

Michelle Lopez

Group: 3721

Mail Stop: Amendment Commissioner of Patents P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Sir:

This is a response to the Office Action dated April 26, 2005, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4, 7 and 9 under the Doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-5 and 7-8 of U.S. Patent No. 6, 722,548, rejected claims 1-4 and 7-9 as being unpatentable over the prior art, and indicated that claims 5-6 would become allowable upon having been rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Examiner's indication of the allowability of claims 5-6 are noted and appreciated. However, applicants believe that rewriting these claims in independent form is not necessary as they depend on a claim earnestly believed to be allowable over the prior art.

Reconsideration of the application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.